

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were pending. Claims 8-12, 14, and 16-22 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 13, 15, and 23-27 have been cancelled. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the cancelled claims in a continuation or divisional. Claims 28-31 are newly submitted. The specification has been amended to correct informalities and to correspond with the figures. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 8-12, 14, 16-22, and 28-31 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 22-23 were objected to based on informalities. Applicant has amended claim 22 to depend from claim 21, and has cancelled claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim objections.

II. The § 112 Rejections

Claims 8-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that sending digital data between a base station (of a cordless phone) and an internet service provider (ISP) through a modem is not possible. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Digital modems, and particularly cable modems (as discussed in Applicant's specification at page 7, lines 7-9) are types of modems that can receive and transmit digital data. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, in view of the specification, provide sufficient disclosure for one of skill in the art to make and use the invention.

Claims 14-15 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the § 112 rejections.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 112 rejections.

III. The § 102/103 Rejections

Claims 8-9 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237 ("Sayers").

Claims 10-15 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 6,539,237 ("Chiu").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 8, as amended, recites a method for sending a call from a cordless phone system to a device. The cordless phone system includes a cordless unit and a base station, and is coupled to an internet service provider through a first modem. The method includes utilizing the cordless unit to initial the call. If the cordless unit is within range of the first base station, then the call is routed to the ISP via the first modem, otherwise, the call is routed to the ISP via a second modem that is coupled to a second base station, which second base station is within range of the cordless unit.

A potential advantage of using such a method to send a call to a device is that the method facilitates two-way communication between a cordless unit and multiple base stations thereby creating a cellular-like telephone environment without the use of cellular phones (specification page 4, lines 5-8).

As described in the background section of Applicant's specification at page 2, lines 1-14, in a typical cellular phone system, a city is divided into a number of cells, in which each cell includes a base station. Accordingly, when a user uses a cellular phone, the cellular phone typically uses the closest base station – i.e., that base station that is within the cell corresponding to the user's location.

Sayers describes such a conventional cellular communication system, disclosing the use of cells 11 and associated base transceiver stations 12 which permit users using mobile stations 4

(i.e., cellular phones) to communicate through the GSM protocol for mobile communications (see FIG. 1, col. 2, ll. 40-49). Other than the unique integration of a private wireless network that permits users to freely communicate in both the public and private networks, the basic cellular communication concepts of Sayers were addressed as prior art in Applicant's specification.

In contrast, claim 1 requires communication using a cordless unit and base station associated with a cordless phone system (emphasis added). Sayers' mobile stations 4 (or cellular phones) and base transceiver stations 12 are not equivalent to the cordless unit and base station recited in claim 1. Although the Examiner is entitled to a reasonably broad interpretation of the claim terms, the Examiner must interpret the claims consistent with the specification. MPEP §2111, citing *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). As discussed above, Applicant's specification clearly provides a distinction between a conventional cellular phone system and a cordless phone system. For example, a cordless unit of a cordless phone system typically only has a range of about 1 mile before losing a radio signal (specification page 6, line 22 – page 7, line 1). Conventional cellular phones, however, have a much longer range.

Because Sayers is directed towards cellular phone communications, Sayers fails to disclose any the method steps recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 8, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable over Sayers.

Claim 16 incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 8. Claim 16, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also allowable over Sayers for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

Attorney Docket: RPS920010012068P

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims 8-12, 14, 16-22, and 28-31 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kevin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 493-4540

October 27, 2005

Date